

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 1 and 1A. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1-1A, replaces the original sheet. In Fig. 1, previous element 58 has been changed to element 52; in Fig. 1A element 58 has been omitted/deleted; in Fig. 1A the drain pipe 34 has been altered and element 42 has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 2 are pending in the present application. Applicant's claim for benefit of prior filed application under 35 U.S.C. § 120 has been objected to as not compliant with one or more of the conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. § 120. The proposed drawing correction filed October 17, 2005, has been disapproved as containing new matter. The amendment filed October 17, 2005, is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. The drawings have been objected to because reference numerals 35A, 35B, 39 are missing and reference numerals 51 and 63A are missing. Additionally, the drawings were objected to under 37 U.S.C. § 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The disclosure has been objected to because of an informality. The specification has been objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider all objections.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mathison (Design Pat. No. D373,623). Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,683,597). Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections.

In light of the multiple objections and concerns created from the previous office action, Applicant respectfully

withdraws the previous drawing amendment and amendments to the specification. Additionally, the Applicant submits an amended Fig. 1 and 1A that are the same as the Figs. 1 and 1A of U.S. Serial No. 10/247,247 upon which this application depends. The Applicant has identified changes that were made during the prosecution of the '247 and submits that the drawing is now in proper form and Applicant's claim of priority is accurate. Additionally, the specification has been amended to be the same as the parent application. All amendments place identical wording as is within the parent application. Applicant has attached the original parent application as evidence to show that the amendments made to the drawings and the specification are properly supported by the original application of the parent. Thus, the drawing amendment and the specification amendments are considered to have proper antecedent basis within this parent and no new matter has been entered. Applicant asserts because the previous drawing and amendment to the specification have been withdrawn and a new drawing amendment and specification amendment are presented that all objections regarding the previous drawing amendment and specification amendment have been rendered moot. Additionally, all claims have been cancelled and have been replaced with new claims 3 and 4. Applicant asserts that new claims 3 and 4 are supported by the presently amended drawings and have proper support within the specification such that no drawing deficiencies remain. Thus, Applicant considers all objections either overcome or rendered moot in view of the present amendment.

As discussed above, claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled and new claims 3 and 4 have been provided. Thus, Applicant asserts that the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 102(b) and 103(a) are now moot. Furthermore, claims 3 and 4 are both

patentable over the prior art references because at the very least neither prior art reference teaches "a solid plate having a hollow stub tube that extends outwardly from the plate" nor do they teach "an overflow pipe adapted to extend through the overflow port, the pipe having internal threads." Thus, a combination of the cited prior art references would not result in the inventions of claims 3 and 4 and Applicant asserts claims 3 and 4 are allowable subject matter. In view of the above remarks and arguments and amendments Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

If any issues remain that may be expeditiously addressed in a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 515/558-0200.

All fees or extensions of time believed to be due in connection with this response are attached hereto; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account 50-2098.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy J. Zarley
Reg. No. 45,253
ZARLEY LAW FIRM, P.L.C
Capital Square
400 Locust Street, Suite 200
Des Moines, IA 50309-2350
Phone No. (515) 558-0200
Fax No. (515) 558-7790
Customer No. 34082
Attorneys of Record

- JLH/bjs -

